Questions:

1. What confounding factors do you think need to be controlled in order to determine causation between firearm ownership and homicide rates, or is there a different way to determine causation?
2. When filling in holes in the data, why did you choose to use linear extrapolations or interpolations? Are there different methods that could work better?
3. Do you think that, if you were to go back and repeat the study, you could use the “strictness” of gun laws and restrictions in each state as a predictor? What kind of result would you expect?

4. In the limitations you mentioned how it is unlikely that a putative confounder correlated with gun ownership and gun homicide rates but not any other predictor variables. How do you think the “strictness” of gun laws would relate to the other predictors, and could this variable (or something similar) be the confounding variable?

1. We don’t know which way the relationship goes; more guns could lead to higher crime rate but the reverse could be true, higher crime could lead to more guns (people might be scared by crime and buy more guns). To draw causable conclusion (no gold standard): certain levels of evidence, type of study that would give higher level of evidence (show that changes in firearm ownership led to changes in homicide rates over time), time period analysis

3) In our study we could have controlled for the strength of gun laws, could have affected gun ownership and gun violence, also control for gun ownership in our study, otherwise people might argue that states with laws might have less people with guns

What should we control for: most important variables are crime rate, violent crime data (available on fdi website), 2016 data might be present

Race was important, percentage of black people is strongly correlated

Urbanization, percent of people living in city, population density

Something related to socioeconomic status (poverty, unemployment, median household income, education level), all correlated together so you need at least one measure, not necessarily all of them

Combination of age and gender, percentage of young males strongly correlated 15-29,

Question about controlling for race: we thought it was a factor of socioeconomic status, those two controls would be very strongly correlated

Logical, but might not be true: would be true if all states had a similar proportion of blacks, so many people are white, their economic status will be an influence

Script:

Introductions

Mention paper

Questions

Our ed/workflow

State law database, tracks fourteen different categories of laws for states, 1991-2017, Be selective with laws, not just random laws, only include strongest laws